DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 885 JC 690 361

By-Chadbourne, James P.

The Future Is Now!; Report of a Workshop for New Junior College Deans of Instruction (Los Angeles, July 7-12, 1969).

California Univ., Los Angeles. Junior Coll. Leadership Program.
Pub Date 69
Note-22p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20
Descriptors-*Administrative Personnel, Administrator Role, Behavioral Objectives, *College Deans, College Role, *Instructional Improvement, Instructional Innovation, *Junior Colleges, *Workshops

The proceedings of a workshop for 27 new junior college deans of instruction conducted at UCLA were reviewed. The purpose of the workshop was to give the new deans an opportunity to hear of innovations in junior college education emphasizing the instructional systems approach and institutional team building. Topics discussed included: objectives as a basis for supervision and improving instruction; human relations and organizational development; how the dean is seen by other members of the college community; innovations the deans plan to put into action at their respective colleges; the challenges facing the dean and various ways of meeting these demands; and the role of the community college in today's society. The deans also participated in a sensitivity training micro-lab designed to improve leadership skills. A list of workshop leaders and participants was provided. (MB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED032885

"THE FUTURE IS NOW!"

Report of a Workshop

for

New Junior College

Deans of Instruction

By James P. Chadbourne

July 7-12, 1969

Sponsored by the UCLA
Junior College Leadership Program

JC 690 361

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 05 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE

THE ACTION

"The Future Is Now" is a report on a workshop for 27 new junior college deans of instruction, conducted July 7-12 at the University of California at Los Angeles. The UCLA Junior College Leadership staff directed the program, supported by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

The purpose of the workshop was to give the new deans an opportunity to hear of innovations in junior college education, with emphasis on the instructional systems approach and institutional team building.

During the workshop, participants initiated their own innovative projects, which they plan to put into action this fall on their own campuses back home. As a result of associations developed during the week at UCLA, the deans will be able to maintain a cooperative endeavor in the future. Such cooperation should prove helpful to the deans, most of whom have backgrounds in industry and education other than the junior college. A few of the participants are administrators at the state level.

THE LEADERS

Dr. Stuart R. Johnson of UCLA served as director of the workshop. The workshop planning committee included Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education and Director of UCLA's Junior College Leadership Program, and Pat Partridge, a UCLA doctoral candidate.

Dr. Stuart Johnson and his wife, Dr. Rita Johnson carried out final arrangements and acted as both hosts and consultants during the week's activities at Rieber Hall.

THE STIMULATORS

Dale Tillery, Associate Professor of Higher Education and Director of the University of California at Berkeley's Junior College Leadership Program

Frank Jascinsky, Director of Career Development, TRW Systems Group, Redondo Beach, California

Don K. Stewart, Director of Systems for Learning by Application of Technology to Education, Westminster, California

Bruce Monroe, Director of Instructional Systems Group, Seal Beach, California

Dr. Glenn C. Gooder, President of Los Angeles City College

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education and Director of the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program

William H. Stanley, Dean of Instruction, El Centro College, Dallas, Texas

Dr. Richard L. Moore, Dean of Instruction, Moorpark College, Moorpark, California

Chester H. Palmer, Dean of Instruction, Imperial Valley College, Imperial Valley, California

Ellis Benson, President, San Diego Mesa College, San Diego, California

Dr. William Shawl, Dean of Instruction, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, California

Dr. Rita Johnson, Associate Professor of Education, California State College at Los Angeles

"The Dean's Scene in the 1970's"

Dale Tillery, a former dean of instruction and now Director of Berkeley's Junior College Leadership Program, sounded the theme of the workshop in his keynote address. Many in his audience were struck by the forcefulness of his comment, "The future is now."

Professor Tillery made several predictions for the junior college in the immediate future:

"The college is going to be 'home base' for our society, because home and church no longer serve this function.

"The community college is the institution which will serve the neglected of our society." He stressed that only five years ago, faculty were complaining that "they could not be all things to all men." Now they know that they must make a concerted effort to help the uneducated.

"The authority conflict which we see about us is going to increase," although the locus is changing. "Much of the conflict has been between administration and students. In the future it will be between students and faculty.... Students may be one of the dean's greatest allies."

"Control will demand levels and degrees of effectiveness that we have never had to show before. We are faced with closing the gap between what we claim to be doing and what we are actually accomplishing. We must have evidence to close the gap between instruction and accomplishment." He noted that mention of behavioral objectives "raises the faculty's hackles. This is a really touchy area, but I don't know how we back away from it."

"Whole new approaches are needed for evaluation. Much of what we do now--the way we slice the curriculum and what we do in guidance--will not be accepted in the future, because it's not going to work in the future.

"Educational technology and systems will change the whole area of education. These new technologies have the promise of revitalizing education ... and

there will be a major shift in the power structure of education.

"As we've been working with presidents across the country, we're getting a new message. They talk about the new appeal for power. Now students go directly to the source of power, whether it be dean, president, or trustees. Increasingly, students are talking about the passive deans who are voluntarily giving up their dean's prerogatives.

"We now have very viable faculty bodies, and faculty authority has been a blessing in many instances. Shared authority means whole new styles of operation to the dean. The talents required of him change....Increasingly, we're seeing a flattening of the junior college administrational pyramid. The dean's position is increasingly going to have to be earned."

OBJECTIVES AS A BASIS FOR IMPROVING INSTRUCTION

Several of the guest speakers directed the participants to focus attention on the ends of instruction. Don K. Stewart, director of SLATE, led the group in suggesting the many values of defined educational outcomes by exposing what he considered current educational malpractices. Bruce Monroe, director of Instructional Systems Group, demonstrated how defined outcomes can be written and refined.

Here are some assorted highlight quotations from their stimulating presentations:

-- Education is the only profession that fails its clients by design.

-- The greatest student problem is: What am I supposed to learn?

-- Education is the random experience of a lifetime; instruction is learning by design.

-- The key question in instructional improvement is: Did students learn?

-- Only in education do we give the test first, then diagnose--and then ignore the results of the tests!

-- We need increased competence in diagnosing student learning problems.

-- Curve grading is a malpractice which pushes out the lower achieving students, only to reward a portion of those remaining with "F" grades.

-- Our high attrition rates indicate our inefficiency in the instruction business. We can no longer professionally support failure.

-- Let the student know where he's going by giving him the final exam on the first day.

-- Use technology to increase the humanization factor in education: the number of hours a teacher spends with individuals or small groups divided by the number of hours spent lecturing.

-- Stop the development of cumulative ignorance through giving students C's, D's, and F's. Give incompletes until they learn. They will!

-- Test items <u>are</u> objectives. Examine yours.

-- Here are two questions to ask of instructional materials: Instruction for which objectives? How do you know instruction occurred?

OBJECTIVES AS A BASIS FOR SUPERVISION

At Golden West College, Dr. William Shawl, dean of instruction, demonstrated further uses for defined outcomes in education. Dr. Shawl has developed an approach to supervision of instruction that places the dean in a partnership with the faculty member. Under this plan, instructor and dean meet for one to two hours in the fall to develop a reasonable set of projected student outcomes.

In the spring, teacher and dean meet again to discuss results. The chief question is: How much did the students learn? Then dean and instructor discuss ways of increasing teacher effectiveness.

Three members of the Golden West English department presented detailed examples of how the instructional improvement approach to supervision has changed their lives. All three are enthusiastic about this technique.

Here are some of the comments generated at the Golden West session:

-- The problem of class visits is that the dean observes means, not ends.

-- Class visitation is not really a very fair way of evaluation, since the teacher and the evaluator may well have different objectives. Both need to agree on the ends of instruction.

-- "I get more involved in instruction improvement by working with my faculty to assist them in achieving their teaching objectives than I ever did by visiting classes." --Dean Shawl.

-- Supervision by objectives is time-consuming, but probably no more so than any other method--and it does develop more collegial relationships, which are most important.

-- Start out with developing objectives in one course, then go on from there.

-- The use of defined outcomes is an evolutionary process as you add more appropriate objectives and delete others.

-- When the student shares the teacher's objectives, the student asks more meaningful questions.

-- Departments can agree on terminal objectives, while individual members can use individual initiative in reaching those objectives.

-- When different means to the same ends are employed, you have a beautiful set-up for evaluating different instructional approaches.

-- The question is not "Is he a good or bad teacher?" but "Are his students learning?"

-- The purpose of evaluation is to improve instruction, not to rank or rate instructors.

-- The development of behaviorally stated objectives gives the new teacher a systematic framework for his course content.

-- Defined outcomes tend to reduce irrelevance.

-- Unless the department can agree on terminal objectives, the courses in that department should not be taught except as electives.

-- "The use of defined outcomes changed my life. For the first time, I was required to justify the relevance of my course content. This process helped to develop my sense of confidence in the classroom."--An instructor.

-- "I have more time now to work with individual student problems, since assignments need little formal explanation."--An instructor.

HUMAN RELATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

By Wednesday the deans were becoming better acquainted with one another and with the challenges facing the community college in the decade to come. They responded eagerly to a day-long seminar on "Human Relations and Organizational Development" led by Frank Jascinsky of TRW. Dividing the deans into subgroups of five or six, Jascinsky guided them through a series of exercises designed to change organizational systems and improve personnel relations.

One mini-session led the deans to define the chief characteristics of the best job they had ever held in these terms:

-- Worthwhile work.

-- Impact on others.

-- Satisfactory inter-personal relationships.

-- Autonomy of decision-making.

-- Creativity and innovation.

-- Sense of accomplishment.

-- Self-realization.

-- Contribution to society.

A third of the deans described their present position, but whatever the job they had in mind, Jascinsky noted that they had probably worked harder in that job than they had ever worked in their lives. He added that these eight characteristics are a kind of gestalt, and people everywhere, whether it be in Japan, South America, or the United States identify similar characteristics. Thus it appears that man's definition of worthwhile work is not culturally bound.

Interestingly, the deans made almost no mention of salary or security. Only two mentioned money, and then it was at the tail end of their lists.

In Jascinsky's words, "Money is only a benchmark, a kind of feedback on how one is doing."

To develop a strong and healthy organization, Jascinsky recommends these points:

. Openness to stimulate creativity.

. Responsiveness to the ideas of others.

. Informality and freedom to cross levels and boundaries within the organization.

. Focusing on the problem and trying to identify it.

. Deriving structure and discipline from the problem itself.

Each individual in a healthy organization must learn to act in a responsible manner. Here are some suggestions:

. Deal with conflict directly.

. Deal with the here-and-now, not with the past.

. Remain "in-process" and allow yourself to change.

. Accept responsibility for your own behavior.

. Remain introspective and ask, "How am I doing?"

. Have a bias toward optimism.

. Have internalized rewards and controls.

. Give day-to-day coaching to one another.

. Maintain role flexibility and adaptability.

THEORIZING ABOUT HOW OTHERS MIGHT SEE THEM

Once they had agreed on the aspects of the ideal job, the deans moved on to a discussion of their relationships within the college. J. Robert Trevor, Vice President of Instruction at Penn Valley Community College, Kansas City, Missouri, bravely volunteered to be "it" in a game which might well have been called "Get the Dean." Encircled by the deans, who acted out the roles of various segments of the college population, he dealt rapidly with their criticisms. While the deans view of themselves as others see them is naturally somewhat limited in perspective, they made many telling points which indicate their sensitive awareness of factional differences.

Here are some of the most significant criticisms of the dean:

BOARD OF TRUSTEES--The dean recommends that we hire controversial people, and he protects faculty members who should not be protected. Even worse, he does not understand our budget limitations!

ADMINISTRATION--The dean over-represents the faculty and is insensitive to our problems and student needs.

FACULTY--The dean fails to communicate with us. He represents the institution instead of us. He makes unilateral decisions and always takes the students' point of view.

STUDENTS--The dean does not permit us to have a voice in curriculum development and teacher evaluation. He enforces unrealistic rules and regulations.

COMMUNITY--The dean makes arbitrary decisions regarding admission procedures, probation, and suspension of students. He restricts community use of college facilities.

After hearing the long list of complaints, one student-for-a-day piped up, "The dean? I didn't know we had one! Where does he hide?"

PLANS FOR ACTION

An indication of the real success of this workshop can be seen in the "plans for action" submitted by the participants. These plans detail actual innovations which the deans intend to put into practice at their respective colleges.

Islands of Innovation Expanding, by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education and Director of UCLA's Junior College Leadership Program, served as a stimulus and source of innovative practices for the deans. Dr. Johnson's highly acclaimed book reports on his recent nationwide survey of innovations in the junior college.

On Thursday, Dr. Johnson outlined the changes taking place in junior college instruction today. These are some of the developments:

Expanding interest in programmed instruction in the junior college.

Increasing use of the audio-tutorial and systems approaches to instruction.

Promising results in the use of games as a junior college teaching device for low-achieving students.

Increasing use of television to present course segments.

Increasing construction and use of electronic lecture halls which allow teams of learning specialists to adapt technology to education.

Use of students as teachers.

Growth of student-operated experimental colleges.

Development of work-study programs.

Use of behavioral objectives for improving instruction.

Plans for Action were presented by each dean, and duplicated copies were distributed to the group for discussion and comment. Some of these plans to be implemented in September at the various colleges include these promising innovations:

The use of a cassett-like device for showing film loops on home television sets in a district which covers 2400 square miles.

The use of typewriters in an English composition class.

The implementation of a systems approach to instruction at a new campus.

The development of programmed lessons to insure entry competence for successful work at the junior college.

After the deans had presented their plans, Dr. Johnson summarized their emphases. He found a stress on the use of technological aids to learning, great variety in approaches to teaching, and concern for integration of promising ideas from disparate sources.

He cautioned that few of the deans had mentioned a method of evaluation, then pointed out, "Evaluation is essential if soundly conceived innovation is to result in more effective achievement of the outcomes you are aiming for."

Dr. Johnson suggested that the group become "first-class idea stealers" who use innovative change as a basis for improving instruction, achieving outcomes, and resolving problems.

Some may ask how they can afford to innovate with budgetary restrictions.

Dr. Johnson replies: "How can you afford not to innovate? Technology can provide time-saving which can lead to more personal teaching."

THE DEANS VIEW THEIR CHALLENGES

Thursday afternoon's mutual problem exchange allowed the deans to "sound-off" and discuss solutions. Deans Moore and Palmer and President Benson were on hand to offer stimulating approaches to the problems that confront today's deans. Here are some of the comments from this session:

-- Most of our innovations are administration initiated. We asked why, and the faculty cited faulty communication. Sensitivity training with small groups of faculty and administration has given us an opportunity to develop communication.

-- We use committees composed of faculty, administrators, and students to open communication lines.

-- What role should the faculty senate play in decision-making? What about student power?

-- Mobilize the community. Give the residents what they need by getting students, faculty, and community leadership to design their own programs, with the dean's leadership.

-- The dean of students should be aware of student unrest and can provide a good sounding board.

-- The junior college must learn to attack its problems in new ways. In our conservatism, we have lost much of our reputed flexibility and diversity.

-- Why have grades? Why have time limits for course completion?

-- Use minority students to look for your minority faculty. We don't know where to look; our students do.

-- The main function of the dean is educational leadership--the ability to bring faculty from one point to another. Clerks can do the scheduling.

-- Don't stay in your office. The important questions aren't going to cross your desk. Be out with your faculty where you can advise them on procedure.

-- Encourage student rating of faculty. Salutary effects can occur.

-- We beat the problem of high attrition rates with our voc-tech students by offering them an exciting team-taught interdisciplinary general education course. Now our transfers are demanding courses equally exciting!

-- Turn-on your faculty by getting funds for faculty travel. Let your teachers discover new ideas.

-- There's nothing wrong with paying your faculty members to develop new courses. We put our interested faculty on nine-hour loads as a result of savings from large-group instruction.

-- Deans are evaluated by their success or failure in completing their jobs.

GOODER ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The new deans heard some stirring words on the role of the community college in today's society from Gleen C. Gooder, president of Los Angeles City College. Only 11 years ago, Gooder was an assistant dean of instruction. Today he is managing to keep his administrative ship afloat, despite the strong currents of urban pressures and student demands.

Here are just a few highlights from his speech:

"Demands are placed upon education to bring about a balance between quantity and quality in the broader society as well as on the campus. Many Americans do not yet participate fully in the American dream, and they look to education as their avenue to full participation.

"Thousands of poor, disenfranchised, unemployed and unemployable Americans are moving to the large urban centers in search of a better life. Unfortunately, many are not finding life better in the cities. They are, in fact, finding it worse and their frustration deepens. They expect education to help people prepare to cope with urban blight and its devastating effect on people.

"They expect education to help people prepare to cope with the terribly destructive cross-currents of racial strife.

"Both students and faculties demand a greater voice in institutional decision-making. The public, the trustees, and the administrators, already sensitive to their loss of power, demand an increase, not a reduction, in their control. Faculties insist upon a greater share of society's material rewards. Taxpayers and donors, already sensitive to the great burden they carry, demand greater economy and efficiency and the freedom to withdraw support when what occurs on the campus is not to their liking.

"It is no wonder that stresses and strains are generated as these forces contend. Again, it must be apparent that we are dealing here with more than an 'educational' problem."

In case you are wondering how your workshop and your role as a new dean of instruction relate to this discussion, this is it. The very best way for us to work to restore trust and confidence between college and community is for us to prove that we are capable of meeting the needs of people....It is not necessary for either this society or the community college to develop and state new objectives. What is needed is a new determination and a new strategy for achieving the objectives we have stated again and again.

What is needed in the community college is for us to become what we profess to be. We need to become, truly, the "comprehensive" college, the "open-door" college, the "teaching" college, and the "community" college.

When we begin to navigate with clear vision--when the development of human potential is understood to be our business--we will be in a position to restore a feeling of mutual trust and confidence between college and community. To do this we must declare our independence of traditional procedures in higher education. We must refuse to be bound by the models of other institutions. We must get back to the basics--people and their potential for growth. We must revolutionize our enterprise as the computer has revolutionized the processing of information. Gooder emphasized that when we are, truly, a comprehensive college, our curriculum will be planned after we meet our students, not before. We will assign learning experiences to students, not students to learning experiences.

Our aim will be to "prepare students to live in the world as it is and will be, not as it has been."

"When we are, truly, the 'open-door' college,...we will accept all students for what they are and for what they may be. No one will be turned away with the admonition to return when he is well enough to take our medicine.

"We will, for many students, make guidance the basic core of the learning experience.

"When we are, truly, a 'teaching' college, students, not subject matter, will be central to our business. We will seek, hire, honor, and advance teachers who are specialists in learning in preference to teachers who are specialists in subject matter. We will teach students to learn.

"We will break time barriers in education....Credit will be recorded as objectives are met, not as dates occur.

"When we are, truly, a 'teaching' college, we will re-design and re-structure our learning environment so that those who are capable of learning do learn.

"Finally, when we are, truly, a 'community' college, the physical, psychological, and cultural boundaries between college and community will disappear.... In the community of the college, each student will be a participant rather than a recipient. We will understand that while much student unrest is generated by those who want to destroy the 'establishment,' much more is generated by those who simply want to be a part of the establishment so that they may help to design its structure and help to shape its future."

BACK-HOME STRATEGIES

At the closing session, Dr. Rita Johnson led the deans in a sensitivity training micro-lab. Designed to improve leadership skills, the lab proved to be the week's most valuable experience for many of the deans. As a major benefit, they cited their improved ability to communicate more genuinely with others.

The deans learned to discriminate between these types of communications:

Personal and impersonal

Feelings and thought or opinion

Here-now and there-then

Encountering or confronting behavior versus evading behavior

Risk-taking versus avoiding or resisting behavior

Through an examination of the cyclic nature of group processes, the participants came to understand that leadership training is one more instructional system which can be programmed and monitored, developed and improved in light of outcomes.

SUMMING UP

This report of a very busy week would not be complete without mention of one lighter, but very educational visit. At Disneyland, everyone had a good time away from the serious deliberations on innovations, behavioral objectives, systems approaches to efficiency, the need for sensitivity in human relations, and the need to sell the community college idea.

More than one dean commented that futuristic Disneyland is a model of efficient operation which educators might well copy. And in the flux and flow of Disneyland, one can see the constancy of change which was one of the workshop's themes.

Because the community college must work to close the gap between promise and practice, the call was issued for deans who are educational leaders. These are the men capable of conceptualizing change and motivating their colleagues to plan for those changes in improving instruction and understanding of our fellow men. Above all, they must meet the needs of our students.

McLuhan has commented on the very human tendency to apply old solutions to new problems, an approach which leads us to march backwards into the future. Contrary to this approach, the workshop for new deans focused on new solutions to new problems in "the future," now.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Waldo Anderson, Chairman, Graduate Studies in Education, College of Education, The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

Dr. William E. Berry, Dean of Instruction, Glendale Community College, Glendale, Arizona

Dr. James H. Bos, Dean of Instruction, Anoka-Ramsey State Junior College, Coon Rapids, Minnesota

Mr. Alexander Brown, Conestoga College of Applied Arts & Technology, Kitchener, Ontario, Canada

Dean George L. Cooper, Hutchinson Community Junior College, Hutchinson, Kansas

Mr. Gary W. Dean, Mt. Royal Junior College, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Dr. Wayland DeWitt, Dean of Instruction, Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, Washington

Dr. Marion G. Donaldson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Maricopa County Junior College District, Phoenix, Arizona

Dr. Royce P. Flandro, Utah Technical College, Provo, Utah

Dr. Ellis G. Hanson, Des Moines Area Community College, Ankeny, Iowa

Dean Herbert C. Kalk, Wilson Campus, Chicago City College, Chicago, Illinois

Dr. John M. Kingsmore, Essex Community College, Baltimore County, Maryland

Mr. Antonio Matos, Arecibo Regional College, Arecibo, Puerto Rico

Mr. Charles R. Moench, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa

Dean Harriet H. Nakamoto, Kapiolani Community College, Honolulu, Hawaii

Dr. Walter L. Nelms, Dean of Instruction, Jackson State Community College, Jackson, Tennessee

Dean Leon F. Osinski, Delaware Technical & Community College, Northern Branch, Wilmington, Delaware

Dean Arland W. Otte, Normandale State Junior College, Bloomington, Minnesota

Mr. Wendell L. Reeder, Dean of Academic Affairs, Clackamas Community College, Oregon City, Oregon

Dr. William H. Stanley, Dean of Instruction, El Centro College, Dallas, Texas

Dr. W. B. Stoddart, Seneca College of Applied Arts & Technology, Willowdale, Ontario, Canada

Dean R. Strenger, Saint Gregory's College, Shawnee, Oklahoma

Dean Thomas W. Sullivan, Dean of Instruction, Aims College, Greeley, Colorado

Dr. Vernon L. Taylor, Platte College, Columbus, Nebraska

Mr. J. Robert Trevor, Vice President of Instruction, Penn Valley Community College, Kansas City, Missouri

Mr. William E. Truitt, Division of Research & Higher Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery, Alabama

Dean Frank Zannini, Roger Williams College, Providence, Rhode Island